Duncanville Independent School District

Brandenburg Elementary School

2026-2027 Priorities/Goals/Strategies



Mission Statement

Duncanville ISD: We engage, equip, and empower all scholars to achieve their unique potential.

Vision

Where dreams are inspired and excellence is achieved

Value Statement

We are D'Ville...

P - Professionalism

A - Accountability and excellence

N - Nurturing, safe environments

T - Transparent communication

H - Honesty, integrity, and ethics

E - Everyone contributing to student success

R - Relationships, equity, and inclusion

S - Students as our top priority

Table of Contents

Priorities 4
Priority 1: Student Academic Success 4
Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community 22
Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development 25
Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence 28

Priorities

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 1: By June 2027, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Reading at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 37% to 45% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the LIFT Reading PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment, including but not limited to tutoring, use of online software and instructional materials to support learning. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2027, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 7% to 45% at the 50th percentile. Will add after testing next week.

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize iReady and IXL to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment and IXL reports. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2027, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 12% to 45% at the 50th percentile. Will add after testing.

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 4: By June 2027, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Math at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 35% to 45% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the District Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2027, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Math testing will increase from 3% to 45% at the 50th percentile. Will add after testing.

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Phillips/Banks/Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Phillips/Banks/Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 5 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2027, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Math testing will increase from 3 % to 45% at the 50th percentile. Will add after testing.

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.
Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2027, student achievement on the state assessments in Reading will increase at approaches from 68% to 85%, meets from 37% to 45%, and masters from 11% to 35% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the District Reading PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading.Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.
Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2027, student achievement on the state assessments in Math will increase at approaches from 52% to 85%, meets from 30% to 45%, and masters from 9% to 35% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading and Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.
Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2027, student achievement on the state assessments in Science will score approaches at 85%, meets at 45%, and 35% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the district Science PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Science. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 1: By June 2027, stakeholder's beliefs as measured on the Spring Climate Survey- MRA "in our commitment to prepare our students for college career readiness" will increase from 77% to 80%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Leader in Me MRA spring survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Create and implement a system to gather data for our MRA survey. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased MRA scores in spring of May 2026. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Patience Reed **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2 - Perceptions 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Design and implement along with the counselor a "Career Day" plan. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased MRA scores. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Robyn Moline **TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: All students and staff are new to the school. **Root Cause**: Changing campuses creates a need for building relationships with community and building school culture.

Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 95%. **Root Cause**: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. **Root Cause**: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 2: By June 2027, ADA will increase from 94% to 95%.

Evaluation Data Sources: ADA reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Hold weekly monitoring of attendance to address attendance concerns, supports needed, and next steps to close attendance gap. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased ADA. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillip/Mayra Yera **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Demographics 2 - Perceptions 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Create and implement an attendance incentive plan. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased ADA. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Mayra Yera **Problem Statements:** Demographics 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 95%. **Root Cause**: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly
Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. **Root Cause**: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2027, the number of teachers meeting "accomplished" or higher on T-TESS will increase from 50% to 55%.

Evaluation Data Sources: TTESS summative ratings

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Embed TTESS dimension 2.3 connections into PLC's. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased TTESS ratings. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 2: The percentage of teachers holding a valid Texas Certification will increase from 85% to 88% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR documentation of certified vs. non-certified.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Create and implement a support plan to assist staff with obtaining certification. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** More staff on campus are fully certified. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/Lisa Maia **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. **Root Cause**: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 3: The retention rate of "certified teachers" will increase from 79% to 82% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR documentation on teacher retention.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Monitor progress of teachers who are seeking certification. Create quarterly check-ins for staff. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase in teacher retention. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: All students and staff are new to the school. **Root Cause**: Changing campuses creates a need for building relationships with community and building school culture.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 1: The campus will support the district goal regarding the amount of funds spent on "instructional expenditures (Function 11)" to increase from 52.74% to 60% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: Campus budget.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Balanced budget **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/campus secretary **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate half of students are achieving grade level standards. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 2: The campus will support the district goal of improving the School FIRST rating from an A-90 to A-94 by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: Campus budget.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: The principal will build staff awareness of fiscal compliance through campus training on purchasing and budget procedures twice a year. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Balanced budget. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips/campus secretary **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading, math and science. **Root Cause**: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, inconsistent coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 3: The campus will support the district goal in reducing the payroll expenditures by 5% from 85.36% to 80.36% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: Campus budget.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: The principal will work with Human Resources to prioritize campus staffing based on student needs and instructional priorities to reduce expenditures at campus leveling and the district budgeting at district level and the district annual budget review. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased staff retention. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Alicia Phillips **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. **Root Cause**: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school.